

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 to 8 and 10 to 19 are pending. Dependent Claim 19 is new. No claims are allowed.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 14 has been amended to render the claim definite. Claim 18 has been corrected. Claim 9 has been deleted and incorporated into Claim 1.

Claims 1 to 4, 6, 8, 10 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hilton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,140,801). Claim 1 has been amended to claim the process as set forth in the description in paragraph [0021] beginning on page 8. This process involves the fermenter 10 (reaction vessel) with a recirculating aqueous medium with a strainer 11 at the outlet so that the uncooked processed food is suspended in an aqueous medium. Nowhere in Hilton et al. is such a process suggested. At best, there is a hydrated mass of potato material described by Hilton et al. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 8, 10, 13 to 14 and 16 to 17 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Silva (U.S. Patent No. 4,500,548). This patent relates to fermenting a dough or slurry to produce volatile flavor aroma components and then spray drying the mixture with the components to produce a fermentation aid. This is a very

Healthtreat 4.1-1  
Appl. No. 10/679,714  
Amendment dated August 21, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated June 14, 2006

different process from that claimed by Applicant which uses a fermenter with recirculation of the aqueous medium for the fermentation into the raw processed food retained in the fermenter. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 8, 11 to 12, 14, 16 and 17 were rejected as anticipated by Hollenbeck (U.S. Patent No. 3,615,697). This reference relates to producing a fermented flour as a flavor additive. The fermentation is of the flour in an aqueous medium. This is also a very different process since Applicant recirculates the aqueous medium through a strainer to the uncooked processed food in the fermenter. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 12, 14 to 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lynn (U.S. Patent No. 5,221,617). This reference also relates to producing an acidic concentrate. There is no recirculation of the aqueous medium for the fermentation through a strainer for the uncooked processed food. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

Claims 5, 13, 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilton et al. This reference has been discussed above. The claims as amended are patentable over this reference. Reconsideration is requested.

Healthtreat 4.1-1  
Appl. No. 10/679,714  
Amendment dated August 21, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated June 14, 2006

It is now believed that Claims 1 to 8 and 10 to 19  
are in condition for allowance. Notice of Allowance is  
requested.

Respectfully,



Ian C. McLeod  
Registration No. 20,931

McLEOD & MOYNE, P.C.  
2190 Commons Parkway  
Okemos, Michigan 48864

Telephone: (517) 347-4100  
Facsimile: (517) 347-4103